

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 12-15, 17-19, and 24-30 are in the application. Claim 1 has been amended by incorporating therein the limitations of Claims 10 and 11, which have accordingly been canceled. Claim 11 has been amended by incorporating therein the limitations of Claims 20 and 21. Claims 22 and 23 have been canceled as being drawn to a non-elected invention. New Claims 24-30 are added, as discussed below.

Claims 1-23 have previously been subjected to restriction under 35 USC 121 as follows:

Group I: Claims 1-11;
Group II: Claims 12-21; and
Group III: Claims 22-23.

The Examiner admits that the Group I and Group II claims are related (Group I - product and Group II - method of making the product). Applicants have amended Claim 1 to include allowable subject matter and have amended Claim 12 to be analogous to Claim 1. As previously requested, Applicants respectfully request rejoinder of Claims 12-15 and 17-19, in accordance with MPEP 821.04.

Claims 22-23 (Group III) have been canceled in response to the restriction requirement.

Claims 1-5, 7, 8, and 10 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu (U.S. Patent 5,811,799) in view of Primeaux (U.S. Patent 5,331,205) and further in view of Applicants' admitted prior art.

The Examiner has indicated that Claim 11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 11 depends from Claim 10, which depends from Claim 1.

Applicants have amended Claim 1 to include the limitations of Claims 10 and 11, thereby obviating the rejection.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu, *supra*, in view of Primeaux, *supra*, and further in view of Todorof et al (U.S. Patent 4,830,678).

Claim 9 depends from Claim 1. As discussed above, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to include the limitations of Claims 10 and 11, thereby obviating the rejection.

Applicants appreciate that Claim 11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants submit that, with the amendment to Claim 1, Claims 1-5 and 7-9 are allowable.

Applicants have provided an additional set of claims, Claims 24-30, which are analogous to Claims 1-5 and 7-9, respectively. The only difference between independent Claim 24 and Claim 1 is that "an hermetic seal" has been changed to --seal-- to reflect the possibility that the seal formed may not be completely hermetic.

The foregoing amendments and arguments are submitted to place the application in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to take such action. If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
MICHAEL P. SCHAUB ET AL

February 5, 2004

David W. Collins
David W. Collins
Reg. No. 26,857
Attorney for Applicants

75 West Calle de las Tiendas
Suite 125B
Green Valley, AZ 85614

Telephone calls may be made to:
(520) 399-3203